REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are elected in the present application. Claims 10-13 are withdrawn. New dependent Claims 14-20 have been added. Applicants respectively request reconsideration of the above referenced Application in view of the above claim amendments and the remarks presented below.

35 U.S.C Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Krishnaswamy (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,318). Applicants respectfully traverses.

Applicants point out that the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1,3, and 8 comprises a translation process that responds to an exception during execution of a stored translated instruction by rolling back to a point in execution at which correct state of a target processor is known. Once the rollback has been implemented, target instruction are interpreted in order from the point in execution at which correct state of a target processor is known.

Applicants point out that this is completely different from the Krishnaswamy reference, which discloses a mechanism whereby code is executed from an exception point up to a point where a guaranteed application state recoverable point occurs. In other words, code continues to execute after an exception is received. There is no rollback. Code execution continues until a guaranteed application state recoverable point occurs (e.g., referred to as a GAR). Upon reaching a GAR, Krishnaswamy then handles the exception. Applicants respectively assert that this is completely different from the rollback mechanism recited in the claimed invention. As explicitly recited in the independent claims of the present invention, exceptions are responded to by rolling back to a point in execution, not by continuing forward in the execution (e.g., until some GAR point is reached, as in

Krishnaswamy). Accordingly, Applicants respectively assert that the claimed invention is not anticipated by Krishnaswamy within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e).

Furthermore, Applicants respectively assert that the exceptions disclosed in Krishnaswamy are different than the exceptions of the claimed invention. The Krishnaswamy reference describes the exceptions as being asynchronous exceptions, for example, from an external event. The exceptions of the claimed invention do not have to be asynchronous exceptions. The exceptions of the claimed invention do not have to be from external events. In one embodiment, the exceptions handled by the claimed invention can be inherent in the target code of the target application, such as exceptions encountered during speculative execution and translation of branch instructions. Applicants have added new dependent Claims 14-20 to more clearly point out such aspects of the claimed invention. Applicants respectively submit that these limitations are not shown or suggested by Krishnaswamy.

35 U.S.C Section 103 Rejections

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being rendered obvious by Krishnaswamy (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,318). Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants point out that the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1,3, and 8 comprises a translation process that responds to an exception during execution of a stored translated instruction by rolling back to a point in execution at which correct state of a target processor is known. For the same rationale as described above, Applicants submit that these limitations are not shown or suggested by Krishnaswamy. Accordingly, the claimed invention is not rendered obvious by Krishnaswamy within the meaning of 35 U.S.C Section 103.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 12/3, 2003

Glenn Barnes
Registration No. 42,293

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060